Olga Glebova
Jan Długosz Academy of Częstochowa

Uncanny Authors, Ambiguous Tales: Metafictional Discourse in J. M. Coetzee's Novels *Foe* and *The Master of Petersburg*

Since the publication, in the late 1960s, of two influential essays, Roland Barthes's "The Death of the Author" (1967) and Michel Foucault's "What is an Author?" (1969), the question of authorship has continued to be the site of intense debate in literary theory. As Andrew Bennett (2005: 127) points out,

> critical interest in literature is driven by an uncertainty about the author, about what the author is, about what *this* author is (this author that we are reading, now, a book in our hands). And such an interest is impelled in fact by the author's irresistible infraction of the limits of textuality, meaning, intention. The condition on which criticism and theory are undertaken, the condition even of reading, is this crisis, this crisis of literature, this uncanny, undecidable author (original emphasis).

Although postmodernism challenges the idea of the author as source and centre of the text, author figures, paradoxically, have become pervasive in postmodern fiction where they often function as a means to articulate a text's metafictional reflection.

This essay aims to discuss how the contemporary debate about the author and authorship is addressed by J. M. Coetzee in his novels *Foe* (1986) and *The Master of Petersburg* (1994). J. M. Coetzee is seen by critics as "a self-conscious postmodernist," "a writer's writer" whose central preoccupation is the nature of authorship, the writer's authority over his subject, as well as the broader issue of the cultural authority to which fiction written within the Western tradition can lay claim (Lowry 1999).

In the two novels under discussion here, Coetzee has revisited authors of the past: *Foe* features Daniel Defoe and rewrites *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) from the female castaway's point of view, while *The Master of Petersburg* re-imagines Dostoevsky and conjures up the genesis of his novel *The Possessed* (1872). Both *Foe* and *The Master of Petersburg* foreground the authors of their pretexts and fictionalize the way the precursory novels were conceived; both can be read

as extensive metafictional discourses offering a developing commentary on the nature and status of the activity of story-telling / story-writing and linking it with notions of power, authority and ownership. It should be added that Defoe and Dostoevsky are the two authors whose influence on Coetzee's writing has been especially significant, they figure prominently not only in his fiction but also in his criticism.

In *Foe* Coetzee revisits and subverts the source text by inserting into the original plot the character of Susan Barton, a female castaway on Cruso's [sic] island. Rescued by an English ship, Susan and Friday finally return to London, yet Cruso dies on the voyage back to England. Out of the four sections of the novel only the first (and the shortest) one – Susan's account of the island episode – offers a narrative which can claim to be a version of the Robinson Crusoe story. The remainder of the novel dramatizes Susan's efforts to tell the island story first through and then over and against the writer Daniel Foe (later Daniel Defoe).

Foe is both a metafictional and political allegory questioning the assumptions of race, class and gender underlying the works of the Western literary canon; it has been described by Dominic Head (1997: 14) as a "textual decolonization." In particular, Coetzee's novel narrativizes the exclusion practices which operate in the construction of a literary canon and reveals that "storytellers can certainly silence, exclude, and absent certain past events – and people" (Hutcheon 1991: 107). As the readers follow Susan's desperate attempt to have her story told and to retrieve Friday's story, they come "gradually to realize the criminal distortion by which Susan will be written out of the story altogether, and the tragic truth of Friday's experience will be misrepresented as benign, as comedy" (Burnett 1996: 245). Drawing our attention to the fact that Foe was Defoe's real name, Coetzee exposes him as enemy of truth, the giver of false witness. Paula Burnett (1996: 245) reminds us that "in Protestant Christian parlance the Foe is the devil, the old enemy. In the moral landscape of the text, Mr Foe is unmasked as a figure of the devil, seducing with his apparently reasonable blandishments, then disappearing when he has done his evil work, leaving a trail of unpaid debts." Thus, Coetzee's novel constructs authorship as seduction and betrayal, as distortion of truth, while Foe – the author, representing the voice of the elite culture of patriarchal power, is seen as a bearer of guilt who, by silencing the voices of the Other of gender and the racial Other, fails in his authorial responsibility.

In Coetzee's novel, there is a continuing debate as to who determines the boundaries of the story and, as a result, controls and owns the narrative. Since

Susan shared the island experience with Cruso and Friday, can she claim the island story as her own? Or is she only telling Cruso's story in his absence? And what are Friday's rights in this regard? While Susan wants to recount the island episode, she realizes that she is not equipped to do it and needs Foe's experience and established reputation as professional writer. Yet, Susan's views as to where her story begins and ends are very different from those of Foe. While Foe sees her story as describing a quest for her abducted daughter, with the adventure of the island being only a fragment of it, Susan insists that her time spent in Brazil, searching for her daughter, is not part of her story. As Patrick Corcoran (1996: 260) observes, this differing point of view about the limits of the story and especially about who has the right to set those limits, contains elements of a power-struggle. The metafictional discourse here closely parallels the novel's exploration of power relationships.

Coetzee further problematizes the question of the ownership of stories by highlighting the polysemantic nature of the author's name. Following the ideas of Michel Foucault (1979) who wrote that the author's name has both a descriptive and a designatory function, Coetzee calls attention to the fact that the author's name functions as a cultural signifier and that today Defoe has become a half-real, half-fictional character. According to Jean-Paul Engélibert (1996: 272), there exists a myth of Daniel Defoe – the author, which constructs Defoe as "the poor but prolific writer, eternally creating yet eternally the victim of his own undertakings, inventor of the 'English novel.'" This mythic Defoe, writes Engélibert (1996: 268):

> combines all the characteristics of the writer and the adventurer. He presents us with the spectacle of adversity and of perseverance, of courage and of genius, of a life of suffering and wandering and yet a life of inexhaustible energy; inventing a new literary form against all the odds he becomes a hero of the act of writing.

In other words, just as the author generates texts, texts generate the author. Revealed to be a discursive construct, the author is dispossessed of his work; the authoritative and controlling role of the author is called into question and the author's exclusive right over his own texts is problematized. Coetzee's novel also rejects what Roland Barthes (1995) called the myth of filiation – the traditional notion of authorship that views the author as a kind of parent giving life to a text – and emphasizes the intertextual nature of authorship as it portrays Foe feeding his writing on other people's stories.

Coetzee's text offers a view of the creative process as possessing an extremely ambiguous nature. On the one hand, writing is seen as an authenticating

and authorizing process – something necessary to record experience and give it "substance:" without any clear written account of her stay on the island, Susan feels she is a "being without substance, a ghost" (Coetzee 1987: 51). On the other hand, writing inevitably involves misrepresentation and plagiarism.

Foe steals from Susan not only the island narrative but also her life story to use it as source material for another novel, *Roxana, or The Fortunate Mistress.* What is more, his fictional narrative gives Susan a false understanding of her own history. The appearance of the second Susan Barton, who claims to be the long lost daughter of the first, further complicates the story. In the end Susan seems unable to distinguish fact from fiction any longer. The question she asks about the second Susan: "Is she substantial or is she a story too?" (Coetzee 1987: 152), remains unanswered. The introduction of the mysterious figure of Susan's daughter destabilizes the narrative and seems to suggest that the dividing line between fiction and reality can prove to be blurred. Coetzee's novel deconstructs what Gérard Genette (1995: 236) calls "a shifting but sacred frontier between two worlds, the world in which one tells, the world of which one tells" and becomes an expression of the characteristic postmodern view of reality as textuality suggesting that we all, "the narrator and his narratees – you and I – perhaps belong to some narrative."

In the final section of the novel Susan's first-person narration is replaced by that of an unidentified first-person narrator, destabilizing the narrative further both in temporal and fictional terms. This new unnamed and unidentified narrator enters a London property and finds Susan and Foe, presumably dead, in a bed and Friday bricked up alive in an alcove. Pressing his ear close to the door, the narrator hears some strange noises flowing from behind it: "From his mouth, without a breath, issue the sounds of the island" (Coetzee 1987: 154). Then the opening action of slipping overboard is repeated and the whole narrative is revised by revealing that Susan died in the shipwreck with which the narrative began. This cryptic and dreamlike section of the novel received various interpretations.

Paula Burnett identifies the new first-person narrator with the authorial voice – that of Coetzee himself. Friday's story cannot be contained within the bounds of Coetzee's narration, the author can only hand over the narration in dread and hope to Friday as the guilty white race looks to the victimized black for redemption. According to the critic,

> Coetzee as a white South African here acknowledges that he is not empowered to speak for black Africa: the black story will be told elsewhere. [...] The final

> narrator falls silent in the posture of reverent listener, his phase of utterance ended – a symbol of the end of white domination. (Burnett 1996: 248)

On the other hand, the whole metafictional reflection which this part of the novel articulates may be understood as being aimed at disrupting the traditional power relations implicit in the dichotomy author-reader and rejecting a linear epistemology according to which the left-hand term is seen as superior and dominant. Both Patrick Corcoran and Jean-Paul Engélibert (1996) argue that the author's narrative is replaced in the final section by the reader's narrative who makes sense of the text in a new way. According to Patrick Corcoran (1996: 265), "the power relationships which are analysed through the metafictional discourse must naturally include the reader who also has the power to liberate or enslave." In his turn, Jean-Paul Engélibert (1996: 275–6) points out that

> the final chapter presents a Utopian situation in which the narrative finds itself severed from all authority. [. . .] The narrator-reader has taken over from the female narrator who wanted to be the author. And it is by and through him that the text flows forward, an impersonal energy which disperses itself in the immensity, which bathes him and flows over him. Here, the story of the island no longer has an author and no longer belongs to anyone.

Julie Sanders (2006: 111, 112) suggests that the final section aims at emphasizing the fictionality of the narrative the reader has just been following, while the sounds emanating from Friday render him "a semantic signifier of the island, and all that was suppressed, oppressed, or repressed in Defoe's 'master-text.'"

In comparison with *Foe*, the novel *The Master of Petersburg* is less experimental in its narrative structure; however, it provides a complex and disturbing reflection on creativity at a deeper philosophical level. The novel features Fyodor Dostoevsky as its protagonist and deals with the period of his life leading up to his writing of *The Possessed*. The action takes place in 1869 as Dostoevsky, despite the threat of creditors and the secret police, returns to Petersburg to discover the truth behind the sudden death of his stepson, Pavel, with whom he had a difficult but intense relationship. Agonized by grief and guilt, he moves into the room Pavel rented from a widow called Anna Sergeyevna and reads his diary. He becomes sexually involved with Anna Sergeyevna and attempts to learn from her young daughter, Matryosha, how his stepson lived and died. Dostoevsky is interrogated by councillor Maximov, who investigates Pavel's death and his connections with the Nechaevists, a clandestine group of nihilist terrorists. Dostoevsky also meets the fierce anarchist Sergei Nechayev himself.

Though some elements of the novel recall certain aspects of the life of the Russian writer, Coetzee does not offer a literary biography of Dostoevsky. Just like in Defoe's case, Coetzee rather draws on the myth of Dostoevsky – the author whose name is redolent with complex meaning: one of the founding fathers of modern prose; the author of dark, intellectually complex novels dealing with the themes of suffering, evil and the quest for God and famous for their psychological insights; the writer who was an epileptic all his life and a compulsive gambler and whose brooding, tortured characters are believed to reflect his own manias and rages. The Dostoevsky figure functions in the novel as an emblem of a modern writer. Using Dostoevsky as the focaliser of the novel's third-person narration, Coetzee aims to present the complicated state of mind of an author and to further reflect on the ambiguities of the creative process and ethical responsibilities of a writer.

Coetzee's novel subverts the idea of creative writing as a noble and wholesome activity. By portraying the irreconcilable and often distasteful contradictions within the author's mind and showing how the author draws inspiration from the unlikeliest sources, Coetzee offers a dark view of the creative process as a transgression, a perversion. Remembering the question he was asked by Maximov's assistant: "What kind of book do you write?" – Coetzee's Dostoevsky believes the correct answer should be: "I write perversions of the truth. I choose the crooked road and take children into dark places. I follow the dance of the pen" (Coetzee 1999: 235–6).

In his novel Coetzee appropriates the famous chapter "At Tikhon's," written by Dostoevsky for *The Possessed* but suppressed by his editor M. N. Katkov. This chapter, though never reinstated in the novel, is usually supplied as an appendix in modern editions. In the chapter, the character Nikolai Stavrogin confesses to a sordid liaison with a fourteen-year-old girl, Matryosha. The character of Matryosha, the setting of Stavrogin's tale as well as allusions to pedophilia, appear in *The Master of Petersburg* emphasizing the idea that there are elements in writing which take the writer to the edge of what is ethical. As Coetzee's Dostoevsky muses watching Matryosha: "He has no difficulty in imagining this child in her ecstasy. His imagination seems to have no bounds" (Coetzee 1999: 76). The writer is aware that in his writing as well as in his life, "shame seems to have lost its power" (Coetzee 1999: 24) and he contemplates writing a "book of the night, in which every excess would be represented and no bounds respected," he calls it "a book of evil" (Coetzee 1999: 134).

In *The Master of Petersburg* Coetzee enhances his negative metaphor of writing as betrayal developed in *Foe*. The novel presents the writing activity

through a series of metaphors comparing the writer to a spy, a secret agent and a trespasser, amoral and passive, devoid of shame, who constantly violates the privacy of other people. Initially, mourning the death of his stepson, Dostoevsky believes that fiction is the art of raising the dead and sees the writer as an Orpheus waking up the dead. He hopes that writing as a means of identification with his dead stepson will eventually lead to his own salvation. However, as Dostoevsky reflects with striking openness about himself and what he perceives as evil, ridiculous and shameful in himself, he comes to see writing as treachery and immoral exploitation: he uses everyone and everything – his own very real feelings, his most intimate relationships with other people, his dead son's writing – to fuel his writing:

> Poet, lyre-player, enchanter, lord of resurrection, that is what I am called to be. And the truth? [. . .] I pay and I sell: that is my life. Sell my life, sell the lives of those around me. Sell everyone [. . .] a Judas, not a Jesus. Sell you, sell your daughter, sell all those I love. Sold Pavel alive and will now sell the Pavel inside me, if I can find a way. Hope to find a way of selling Sergei Nechaev too. A life without honour; treachery without limit; confession without end. (Coetzee 1999: 152–3, 222)

For the writer, nothing is going to remain private, everything is going to be published. Betrayal and venality seem to be indispensable components of writing. However, the writer has to pay a very high price for it. At the end of the novel Dostoevsky thinks: "*They pay him lots of money for writing books*, said the child repeating the dead child. What they failed to say was that he had to give up his soul in return" (Coetzee 1999: 250, original emphasis).

Portraying Dostoevsky mourning the death of his son and turning his grief into fiction, Coetzee seems to project onto the fictional writer-character his own private tragedy – his agony over the death of his twenty-three-year-old son in a mysterious falling accident which, as we may infer, has also been turned into prize-winning, best selling and financially rewarding fiction. The father-writer is compared to a scavenger feeding on the decaying flesh: "A father like an old grey rat creeping in afterwards upon the love scene to see what is left for him. Sitting on the corpse in the dark, pricking his ears, gnawing, listening, gnawing" (Coetzee 1999: 107). However, writing, being an expression of parental bereavement, also becomes a painful way for the father to adjust to the death of his son.

Central to Coetzee's novel is the exploration of writing as confession and the reflection on what Sue Kossew calls "the self-mythologizing nature of the text" (1996: 63). Coetzee also dealt with the problem "whether it is possible

to tell the truth about oneself" in his essay "Confession and Double Thoughts: Tolstoy, Rousseau, Dostoevsky" first published in 1985. In this essay, analyzing "At Tikhon's," Coetzee (1992: 289) emphasizes Dostoevsky's presentation of the limits of secular confession, which is characterized by deception and self-deception and represents only partial truth. In the novel, Anna Sergeyevna asks Dostoevsky: "Do you act from the heart all the time? I don't think so" and adds: "Why should I believe you? Why should you believe yourself?" (Coetzee 1999: 167) questioning the very possibility of truth as a potential to know oneself. Coetzee's Dostoevsky reveals "nothing so much as the helplessness of confession before the desire of the self to construct its own truth" (Coetzee 1992: 279). However, despite the novel's skepticism about the accessibility of truth and the possibility of objective self-knowledge, Dostoevsky's self-confrontation and interrogation of his own myth-making is shown as "the most radical intellectual and even spiritual courage" (Coetzee 1995: 15–6).

The novel's final description of the act of writing, when Dostoevsky begins to write what will become *The Possessed*, may be interpreted as the most explicit embodiment of "the Dostoevskian confrontation between faith and skepticism" (Coetzee 1992: 248), or, as Cary Henson (1998) describes it, of the main philosophical debate staged by Coetzee in his novel – the debate between cynicism and grace. In his essay "Confession and Double Thoughts: Tolstoy, Rousseau, Dostoevsky," Coetzee (1992: 392) defines the debate as follows: "Cynicism: the denial of any ultimate basis for values. Grace: a condition in which the truth can be told clearly, without blindness. The debate is staged by Dostoevsky: the interlocutors are called Stavrogin and Tikhon." In the novel, as Cary Henson (1998) points out, this debate is conducted among Dostoevsky's personal, political and authorial selves.

Writing his controversial chapter "At Tikhon's," the writer gambles with and provokes God:

> It is an assault on the innocence of a child. It is an act for which he can expect no forgiveness. With it he has crossed the threshold. Now God must speak, now God dare no longer remain silent. To corrupt a child is to force God. The device he has made arches and springs like a trap, a trap to catch God. (Coetzee 1987: 249)

Not only is this fragment an expression of the writer's skepticism, but, as Rachel Lawlan (1998: 153) rightly observes, it also reveals Dostoevsky's (and Coetzee's own) "longing for grace, for transcendence over contingency and eternal confusion," "finally a longing for authority." In *The Master of Petersburg* a kind of grace and absolution is achieved when the writer transforms his

demons into fiction, which provides an answer to the question Dostoevsky asks himself about the purpose of creativity as he contemplates writing "a book of evil": "And to what end? To liberate himself from evil or to cut himself off from good?" (Coetzee 1999: 134).

Like Coetzee himself, Coetzee's Dostoevsky is a writer of fiction in a highly politicized environment. There are obvious parallels between Dostoevsky's Russia – a country on the verge of a historical upheaval, tortured by injustice and cruelty – and the apartheid South Africa in which Coetzee lived and wrote for most of his life. As Cary Henson (1998) notices, Coetzee

> has been accused of being either reactionary or displaying complicity in the oppression of certain groups in society, and has rejected the violent and anti-intellectual revolutionary movements, choosing instead to try find an authentic voice and narrative that can fully and self-critically explore fiction's role in times of intense ideological pressure.

Like Coetzee, Dostoevsky is beset by the forces of both repression and rebellion. On the one hand, Maximov attempts to induce Dostoevsky to help track down Pavel's revolutionary friends. On the other, their leader Nechaev tries to recruit the author for service in insurgency. As Peter Horn (2002) comments, Coetzee uses Dostoevsky to express his dislike of conformity, either to the state's dictates or to the orthodoxy of opposition. Coetzee does not deny that the writer may have a "duty," but he defines it as a transcendental imperative rather than as an obligation imposed on the writer by society.

Exploring the writer's responsibility in a politically charged context, Coetzee (1992: 98–9) in his novel dramatizes the ideas formulated in his articles on South-African literature in which he speaks against "a literature in bondage, [...] unable to move from elementary relations of contestation, domination, and subjugation to the vast and complex human world that lies beyond them." According to Coetzee (1988: 3), the novel should not be seen as a supplement to history, novelistic discourse is not subordinate to and should not be "colonized by the discourse of history"; on the contrary, it should help to "show up the mythic status of history" and in this way contribute to the practice of "demythologizing history."

There is another important theme which recurs both in *Foe* and *The Master of Petersburg*: the presence of the strong woman, the female partner of the lonely male author, who takes the sexual initiative and who is both "mother and wife, nurse (in the nourishing sense as well as carer for the sick), and Venus" (Burnett 1996: 246). What is more, this strong female character – Susan in *Foe*

and Anna Sergeyevna in *The Master of Petersburg* – has the function of a Muse, who is both the goddess-wooer of the writer and the "true begetter" (Coetzee 1999: 134) of his fiction. Each of these characters projects the female role onto the male writer "using him as vessel, or conduit, for her creativity, reversing the traditional model of sexuality which projects the female as vessel for the male seed" (Burnett 1996: 247). In this way Coetzee's fiction replaces the myth of the father as origin by the older myth of the mother as origin and deconstructs the traditional notion of creativity as a predominantly masculine activity. Moreover, as Paula Burnett (1996: 246) points out, Coetzee's representations of the male as passive partner

> create a model in which patriarchal guilt – the historic association of exploitative dominance with the masculine culture [...] can be alleviated. The phallus is no longer threatening; the female initiative can return the male to an innocent sexuality. The imagination haunted by images of the phallus as weapon finds in the idea of inert coitus with the muse-wooer a long-sought redemption.

In conclusion it has to be said that both in *Foe* and in *The Master of Petersburg*, Coetzee, via an intertextual strategy, focuses on the exploration of some of the darkest and most ambiguous aspects of the creative process and offers a number of disturbing metaphors to conceptualise the author and authorship. However, what finally emerges from our reading of these novels is also the idea of writing as a redemptive act, both in the private and political sense. Moreover, Coetzee subverts conventional views on the creative process and attempts to find a language and a type of narrative that can transcend traditional hierarchies.

In his works Coetzee conducts a dialogue not only with his predecessors, but also with himself as a writer. Each subsequent novel becomes a kind of metatextual commentary on his previous texts. After *Foe* and *The Master of Petersburg*, Coetzee has continued to develop his ideas on the nature of authorship in other works: he has created a fictional author character, Elizabeth Costello, in the 2003 eponymous novel; this character reappears in his novel *Slow Man* (2005) providing a discourse on the interrelationship between the literary author and his characters, between fiction and reality. The latest novel, *Diary of a Bad Year* (2007), whose title and composition can be seen as a structural allusion to Defoe's *A Journal of the Plague Year* (1722), also has a writer as the protagonist. Significantly, Coetzee's Nobel lecture (2003), delivered in the form of an enigmatic short story entitled "He and his man," is a metafictional parable which, like *Foe*, is constructed as an appropriation of *Robinson*

Crusoe and which again includes Defoe as a character. Thus, Coetzee's texts create a textual-metatextual space within which meanings are integrated and the author's views on the metaphysics of writing receive a profound and multifaceted explication.

REFERENCES

Barthes, R. 1995 [1967]. "The Death of the Author." *Authorship: From Plato to Postmodernism: A Reader.* Ed. S. Burke. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bennett, A. 2005. *The Author.* London & New York: Routledge.

Burnett, P. 1996. "The Ulyssean Crusoe and the Quest for Redemption in J. M. Coetzee's *Foe* and Derek Walcott's *Omeros.*" *Robinson Crusoe: Myths and Metamorphoses.* Ed. L. Spaas and B. Stimpson. London: Macmillan.

Coetzee, J. M. 1987 [1986]. *Foe.* New York: Viking.

Coetzee, J. M. 1988. "The Novel Today." *Upstream* 6: 2–5.

Coetzee, J. M. 1992. *Doubling the Point: Essays and Interviews.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Coetzee, J. M. 1995. "The Artist at High Tide. Review of *Dostoevsky: The Miraculous Years, 1865–1871*, by Joseph Frank." *New York Review of Books.* March 3, 1995: 13–6.

Coetzee, J. M. 1999 [1994]. *The Master of Petersburg.* London: Vintage.

Corcoran, P. 1996. "*Foe*: Metafiction and the Discourse of Power." *Robinson Crusoe: Myths and Metamorphoses.* Ed. L. Spaas and B. Stimpson. London: Macmillan.

Engélibert, J.-P. 1996. "Daniel Defoe as Character: Subversion of the Myths of Robinson Crusoe and of the Author." *Robinson Crusoe: Myths and Metamorphoses.* Ed. L. Spaas and B. Stimpson. London: Macmillan.

Foucault, M. 1979 [1969]. "What Is an Author?" *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism.* Ed. J. V. Harari. London: Methuen.

Genette, G. 1995 [1972]. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Head, D. 1997. *J. M. Coetzee.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Henson, C. "Russian Literature in South Africa: J. M. Coetzee's Reading/Writing of Dostoevskij." <http://www.english.uwosh.edu/henson/coetdost1.html>. Posted December 30, 1998. Accessed April 15, 2008.

Horn, P. "Dostoevsky in Cape Town: John Coetzee's *The Master of Petersburg*." <http://www.users.iafrica.com/h/ho/hornpet/Petersburg.htm>. Posted June 27, 2002. Accessed March 31, 2008.

Hutcheon, L. 1991. *A Poetics of Postmodernism*. London & New York: Routledge.

Kossew, S. 1996. *Pen and Power: A Postcolonial Reading of the Novels of J. M. Coetzee and André Brink*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Lawlan, R. 1998. "*The Master of Petersburg*: Confession and Double Thoughts in Coetzee and Dostoevsky." *Ariel* 29: 131–57.

Lowry, E. "Like a Dog. *London Review Bookshop*." <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v21/n20/lowr01_.html>. Posted October 14, 1999. Accessed March 31, 2008.

Sanders, J. 2006. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London & New York: Routledge.